

BEFORE THE ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
IN THE MATTER OF:)
PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF A)
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT TO)
METROPOLITAN BIOSOLIDS)
MANAGEMENT, STICKNEY)

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS taken at the hearing of the above-entitled matter, held at 6040 West Cermak Road, Cicero, Illinois, before Hearing Officer Charles Matoesian, reported by Janice H. Heinemann, CSR, RDR, CRR, a notary public within and for the County of DuPage and State of Illinois, on the 20th day of July, 2005, commencing at the hour of 7 p.m.

APPEARANCES:

MR. CHARLES MATOESIAN, IEPA Acting Hearing
Officer;

MR. CHRISTOPHER ROMAINE, BOA, Manager,
Permit Section;

MR. ERIC JONES, BOA, Permit Analyst.

I N D E X

PROCEEDINGS

PAGES

Hearing Officer's Opening Statement	3 - 5
BOA presentation by Mr. Romaine	5 - 8
BOA presentation by Mr. Jones	8 - 11
Questions/comments from public	11 - 40
Hearing Officer's Closure of Hearing	40 - 41

1 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: We will start
2 this hearing. My name is Charles Matoesian. I will
3 be the hearing officer tonight. This hearing is
4 being held by the Illinois Environmental Protection
5 Agency, Bureau of Air, for the purpose of receiving
6 comments on the proposed issuance of a construction
7 permit to Metropolitan Biosolids Management in
8 Stickney.

9 Metropolitan Biosolids Management has
10 applied for an Air Pollution Control Construction
11 Permit from the Illinois Environmental Protection
12 Agency to construct a sludge-drying facility at
13 6001 West Pershing Road in Stickney.

14 Metropolitan Biosolids Management must
15 obtain a construction permit from the Illinois EPA's
16 Bureau of Air for the proposed facility because it
17 will be a source of air emissions. The facility will
18 take sludge from the Metropolitan Water Reclamation
19 District wastewater treatment plant in Stickney and
20 dry the sludge for its use as a commercial product.

21 Emissions from the facility will be
22 controlled by a variety of devices, including
23 scrubbers, afterburners, and fabric filters. As
24 proposed, the emissions of the facility will be below

1 the level of which the facility would be a major
2 project as defined by the Federal Prevention of
3 Significant Deterioration Rules found at 40 CFR,
4 part 52.21, or the state Major Stationary Sources
5 Construction Modification Rules found at 35 Illinois
6 Administrative Code, part 203. And that information
7 is in the handouts, so don't worry if you couldn't
8 write that all down.

9 The purpose of this hearing is to
10 receive comments and answer questions from the public
11 prior to making a final decision concerning the draft
12 permit. This hearing is being held under the
13 Illinois EPA's Procedures for Permit and Closure Plan
14 Regulations found at 35 Illinois Administrative Code,
15 part 166, subpart A.

16 If you do not wish to make comments
17 tonight, you may make comments in writing. And
18 indeed, lengthy comments and questions are better
19 suited for written submission. The hearing record
20 will be open until August 19, 2005, approximately
21 30 days from today. Written comments need not be
22 notarized, but they must be postmarked by midnight
23 August 19, 2005.

24 I would note for the record that notice

1 of this permit was placed in the Berwyn-Cicero-
2 Stickney issue of Life, with run dates of June 5,
3 June 12, and June 19, all of 2005; as well as in the
4 Lawndale News, West Side Times, with run dates of
5 June 8, June 15, and June 22, 2005.

6 I would also note that we had to change
7 the venue of this hearing due to circumstances beyond
8 our control. It was originally intended to be at the
9 Unity Junior High School auditorium at 2115 South
10 54th Avenue in Cicero, but we had to change it to the
11 present location, Alessandro's Banquet at 6040 West
12 Cermak Road in Cicero.

13 With me tonight are two members of the
14 Agency staff. To my left is Eric Jones, Permit
15 Analyst for the Bureau of Air; and to my right is
16 Mr. Chris Romaine, Manager of the Construction Permit
17 Unit in the Bureau of Air.

18 I will now let Mr. Romaine give the
19 first presentation. Thank you.

20 MR. ROMAINE: Thank you for coming this
21 evening. My name is Chris Romaine.

22 As Mr. Matoesian has explained, the
23 purpose of tonight's hearing is to discuss an
24 application for a project proposed by Metropolitan

1 Biosolids Management, or MBM, at the Metropolitan
2 Water Reclamation District, Stickney Works; and
3 obviously, we refer to them as the MWRD.

4 I would like to briefly discuss why the
5 Illinois EPA's Bureau of Air has approached this
6 project as a modification of the MWRD's Stickney
7 Works and what this means for the project. The
8 Bureau of Air has treated this project, this proposed
9 modification of the Stickney Works, because the
10 project would be getting its raw material from the
11 Stickney Works and would be located on a property
12 that is currently part of the Stickney Works.

13 In this regard, MBM would be relying on
14 the MWRD to be the sole supplier of wet sludge to
15 this facility with material being sent directly from
16 MWRD to MBM. What this means is that the proposed
17 project is subject to more stringent criteria for
18 whether it is being considered a major project than
19 if it were being considered as a project on its own.

20 For example, if the project were being
21 looked at as a stand-alone facility, the criterion
22 for whether the project would be considered a major
23 source of particulate matter emissions would be
24 permanent annual emissions of 100 tons per year.

1 Because the project is being looked at as a
2 modification of the Stickney Works, which is already
3 a major source of emissions, the criteria for a major
4 project that this project is subject to is 15 tons
5 per year for particulate matter. As Mr. Jones will
6 explain, the project is being developed to meet this
7 criteria.

8 In addition, because this project is
9 being looked at as a major -- or as a modification of
10 the Stickney Works, it will eventually have to obtain
11 a rigorous Clean Air Act program operating permit
12 rather than a basic state permit. So it's subject to
13 more stringent permitting requirements both at the
14 construction permit phase and for the life of the
15 project through the operating permit program.

16 However, at the same time that this
17 project is being looked at as part of the Stickney
18 Works for purposes of whether it is a major project
19 or not, it has not been considered part of the
20 Stickney Works for another program under state
21 environmental rules. This is the provisions for
22 local approval of the siting for a proposed new
23 pollution control facility. This is because the MWRD
24 is not an applicant for the project with MBM. MBM is

1 the applicant by itself. Because of this, MBM had to
2 obtain local siting approval from the Village of
3 Stickney, the government that supervises the site of
4 the project. And it did this before submitting its
5 application for this project to the Illinois EPA.

6 What this shows is that even though
7 this project by MBM is clearly related to the
8 Stickney Works, MBM is separate from the MWRD. It
9 will be important that comments tonight clearly
10 distinguish between specific concerns about the
11 proposed project, which is the particular subject of
12 tonight's hearing, and other concerns about the
13 MWRD's existing operations at the Stickney Works.

14 Obviously, we need to make sure that
15 all comments about MBM are discussed, that is the
16 specific purpose of the hearing. As time allows,
17 it's up to the hearing officer how broad he will
18 allow tonight's discussions to be. With that said,
19 thank you for coming tonight.

20 MR. JONES: Good evening. My name is Eric
21 Jones. I am the Environmental Protection Engineer
22 with the Illinois EPA. I was the engineer assigned
23 to the proposed project from Metropolitan Biosolids
24 Management.

1 MBM has submitted an application for a
2 permit to construct a sewage sludge drying plant.

3 The plant would be located on the grounds of the
4 Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater
5 Chicago, MWRD, the existing Stickney wastewater
6 treatment plant, and receive treated sludge from the
7 plant. MBM would then dry the material for use as
8 fertilizer or similar product.

9 The wet sludge material from MWRD would
10 be received at the proposed plant by an enclosed
11 conveyor system and stored in silos. From silos the
12 wet material would then be pumped to hoppers and then
13 to mixers which will combine wet material with
14 material that has already been dried.

15 The wet material would then be dried in
16 four indirectly heated dryers. The dryers would be
17 heated by circulating hot thermal oil through tubes
18 in each dryer so that the wet material would not be
19 exposed to or come in contact with any combustion
20 gases. The exhaust from each of the four drying
21 units would pass through a four-step emission control
22 system.

23 First, emissions would pass through its
24 own condenser to remove moisture. Then it would be

1 passed through a scrubber where it will control
2 particulate matter. And then the third step would be
3 controlled through a thermal oxidizer unit, which
4 will consist of both a primary and a back-up unit.
5 And then this, the exhaust from the thermal oxidizer
6 system, will pass through an odor control scrubber.

7 The emissions from the handling of the
8 dry material produced by the dryers would first be
9 controlled by fabric filters and then through the
10 common thermal oxidizer system. Exhaust from filters
11 on other processes would also be conducted through
12 the odor control system.

13 The thermal oil circulated through the
14 dryers would be heated in three oil-fired boilers or
15 thermal oil heaters. These heaters may be fired with
16 used or reclaimed as well as virgin fuel oil. These
17 heaters are equipped with low NOx burners for the
18 control of nitrogen oxides emissions. Exhaust from
19 the heaters will also be passed through a two-stage
20 scrubbing system. The first section of the scrubber
21 is designed to control particulate matter. The
22 second is to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions.

23 This project complies with all
24 applicable state emission standards in the Title 35

1 and Environmental Protection Act. In addition, the
2 thermal oil heaters would be subject to and should
3 readily comply with the federal New Source
4 Performance Standards for small steam generating
5 units, 40 CFR, subpart (D)(c).

6 As part of the status of the plant,
7 pursuant to PSD, this proposed plant is considered a
8 modification to MWRD. The proposed plant would not
9 be a major project pursuant to the federal Rules of
10 PSD, 40 CFR 52.21, and the state's rules for
11 Nonattainment New Source Review. This is a result of
12 the features of the emission control equipment that
13 has been included in the construction of the plant.

14 Now the Illinois EPA is prepared to
15 answer your questions.

16 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you,
17 Mr. Jones.

18 We will now open the floor to public
19 comments. I have a note, several members of
20 Metropolitan Biosolids Management are present
21 tonight.

22 Anyone wishing to make comments or ask
23 questions, please approach the table and speak into
24 the microphone. Anyone may make oral comments if

1 they would like. However, if you have lengthy
2 comments or questions, or if you would rather submit
3 written comments, once again, the hearing record is
4 being held open until August 19, 2005. Please send
5 any comments to Illinois EPA, Charles Matoesian,
6 that's M-a-t-o-e-s-i-a-n, Hearing Officer, 1021 North
7 Grand Avenue East, P.O. Box 19276, Springfield,
8 Illinois. And the zip code is 62794-9276. And
9 again, that information is available in the handouts.

10 You may ask questions of anyone who has
11 made oral comments providing the inquiry is, firstly,
12 framed as a question; two, relevant to the comments;
13 and three, not repetitious. Arguing or dialogue with
14 any speaker or witness instead of questions will not
15 be allowed. Please direct your questions to myself
16 as hearing officer, and then I will direct the
17 witness to respond as necessary. After you approach
18 the podium, please state and spell your name clearly
19 for the record so that the court reporter can take
20 the information down.

21 And we will now start with Mr. Patrick
22 Williams.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Hi. Patrick Williams.

24 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Excuse me. I'd

1 also state, if you represent any type of organization
2 or community group, please name that as well and
3 state whether you are for or against the granting of
4 this permit. Thank you.

5 MR. WILLIAMS: I would like to know more
6 about the granting of this permit. I am hesitant
7 about it. I live in Berwyn at 37th and Grove. And
8 my first question would be you said that this is a
9 modification of the Stickney Works. And if it were
10 a -- If it were a new project, you said the permit
11 would be for 100 tons? And that this permit is for
12 15 tons per year, is that the --

13 MR. ROMAINE: That's generally what I said,
14 that because it's being looked at as a modification,
15 the criteria for whether it's considered a major
16 project are much more stringent.

17 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.

18 MR. ROMAINE: If it were being looked at by
19 itself, the criteria for whether it would be major
20 would be at 100 tons per year. It is instead subject
21 to 15 ton per year criterion to decide whether or not
22 it's considered major or not.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Do you know what Stickney
24 Works puts out per year at this point?

1 MR. ROMAIN: I don't have that information
2 with us. The Stickney Works is a source primarily,
3 in fact, of nitrogen oxide emissions at the
4 combustion unit of that facility with emissions of
5 something on the order of 100 tons.

6 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. So --

7 MR. ROMAIN: So the problem, or I guess the
8 concern, obviously, is the organic material
9 emissions. But as quantified, those emissions are
10 not large in ton-per-year numbers.

11 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. But I guess what I,
12 what it comes down to is I want to know how much it's
13 going to increase. Because I mean it is, it is an
14 environmental factor in my neighborhood. And I
15 didn't know that when I bought my house.

16 I mean it kind of goes with the
17 seasons. Like you can smell it at certain times and
18 certain other times you can't. And when I bought my
19 house, you couldn't smell it. And then the summer
20 came along, and then you can notice it. So I guess
21 what I'm curious about is how much it will increase.
22 And if there is a comparison that can be made with
23 another sludge-drying facility that's in the area, I
24 would like to hear about that as well.

1 MR. JONES: Well, I will answer as far as
2 the increase proposed by this project. If you look
3 at attachment A of the proposed permit that you
4 received, that summarizes what the total emissions
5 from this proposed project is.

6 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. You know, when we talk
7 about tons, that's sort of -- I mean I'm not a --
8 I'm not a scientist. I don't really know. I just
9 kind of know what it smells like in my back yard. So
10 that's kind of what -- I would like to know how much
11 that is going to change, and I want to -- If that
12 could be explained to, explained to us in terms we
13 can understand, that would be useful.

14 MR. ROMAIN: Unfortunately, that's not the
15 way we generally approach it.

16 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.

17 MR. ROMAIN: We are looking at different
18 aspects of projects. In terms of the issue of odors,
19 that isn't really an issue of tons or amount of
20 emissions. What we can say is this project, as you
21 can understand it from the way it's been described,
22 has carefully been developed to control emissions and
23 prevent odors. So this is not an open-air facility.
24 It is not treating of wastewater. It is conducted

1 inside a building. The building for the ventilation
2 air goes to one system, the specific processing
3 equipment. Then the exhaust from the processing
4 equipment goes through a series of controls. And the
5 purpose of those controls in addition to controlling
6 what we are concerned about in terms of particulate
7 matter and volatile organic material is also to
8 control odorous compounds. But in terms of putting a
9 specific number on the amount of odorous compounds
10 from the existing facility, we are not in a position
11 to do that.

12 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.

13 MR. ROMAIN: I think, in fact, you know the
14 answer to that because --

15 MR. WILLIAMS: I live there.

16 MR. ROMAIN: Whatever the level is you
17 experience it and, obviously, you would like it to be
18 less than it is currently.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: Absolutely.

20 MR. ROMAIN: This facility, though, is
21 being designed so it won't make the situation worse.
22 It probably will not make it any better, though.

23 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Is there a comparable
24 project that's happened in a community close to here?

1 MR. ROMAIN: No.

2 MR. WILLIAMS: Is there a comparable project
3 that's happened in a community anywhere?

4 MR. ROMAIN: There is a project currently
5 underway at the North Shore Sanitary District that
6 also involves a sludge-drying processing facility.
7 So these types of projects do occur, and that is a
8 way to treat sludge that is different than using open
9 air drying beds and, in fact, allows you to come up
10 with a final product that, instead of having to go to
11 a landfill, will go to land application and farms or
12 to other types of rural facilities and can be
13 productive, used as MBM hopes, as a soil amendment at
14 golf courses and similar commercial establishments.

15 So this is not an unusual type of
16 project. It's, however, not a common type of
17 activity in Illinois. I could speculate why that is,
18 and that's because smaller facilities can manage
19 their sludge without having to do the investment in
20 this type of a drying facility. Obviously, this is a
21 very, very large wastewater treatment plant; and
22 there is a lot of sludge to treat. And when you have
23 that big a facility, then it makes sense to use
24 things to mechanically dry the sludge that you might

1 not do at a much smaller facility.

2 MR. WILLIAMS: Where is the North Shore one
3 that you were talking about?

4 MR. ROMAIN: That serves eastern Lake
5 County. I know it serves Waukegan, Zion. I'm not, I
6 assume it -- I think it serves North Chicago, but
7 that series of communities along the lake and a
8 little bit inland.

9 MR. WILLIAMS: But they probably can't smell
10 it in Evanston, right, like where the company is?
11 Just out of curiosity.

12 MR. ROMAIN: No. Evanston is served by the
13 Water Reclamation District.

14 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. If there is other
15 questions, I will let other people ask.

16 MR. ROMAIN: Thank you.

17 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: That was the
18 only listed speaker tonight. Is there anyone else
19 who would like to make a comment or ask a question?

20 MR. DRAKE: Okay. My name is Daniel Drake.
21 I live in Stickney. You might say that I come here
22 on my own, but also I think that I can speak for the
23 citizens of Stickney that are against the expansion
24 of the Metropolitan Sanitary District Works, and

1 including MBM, MWRD, both.

2 As far as getting to one question,
3 smell, the gentleman was just -- didn't like the
4 smell. I have lived at my home for more than
5 45 years. And I have previously, during summers, we
6 don't have an air conditioner. We didn't have an air
7 conditioner. And we would have the windows open, and
8 I would wipe the kitchen table off and have brown
9 stuff on my hands. This is the particulate that is
10 coming out of the Metropolitan Sanitary District.
11 It is not coming from anywhere else but that place.

12 This kind of stuff I breathe daily, you
13 breathe daily. Everyone that lives around there
14 breathes it daily. It's the smell. This particulate
15 means that they have -- the facility has intended to
16 try to reduce that smell. I would like to know what
17 they use to reduce the smell.

18 Now, I saw on the news one day, don't
19 ask me what channel, don't ask me which -- It was
20 telling about a spray that can inhibit or completely
21 wipe out the ability for human beings to smell. And
22 in my opinion, that would -- including, for example,
23 gas that might be leaking from your house and then
24 you can't tell, you are in danger of things.

1 This stuff that comes from MWRD and MBM
2 is going to be an added amount of particulate. There
3 is no going around saying that you can't -- that it's
4 a minus, it's a negative. It's a plus of particulate
5 in the air. The 85-foot stacks, how many are there
6 going to be?

7 MR. JONES: There is going to be one main
8 stack at the facility. It's actually a 90-foot
9 stack.

10 MR. WILLIAMS: Can you speak up? We can't
11 hear you.

12 MR. JONES: There is going to be one main
13 stack coming off the -- I believe it's the odor
14 control scrubber, and I believe it's 90-feet tall.

15 MR. DRAKE: What do they do with the
16 scrubbers when they are worn out?

17 MR. JONES: As far as the --

18 MR. DRAKE: The filters, the scrubbers,
19 those things get thrown out eventually. They get
20 worn out, they get thrown out. Environmental
21 Protection Agency is part of the control of the
22 whole, not just in part of air pollution but the
23 whole; right?

24 So these scrubbers may be made of

1 plastics. I'm guessing, I'm assuming maybe, okay.

2 What are they made of?

3 MR. JONES: Well, this facility is actually
4 going to have both liquid and --

5 MR. DRAKE: A liquid scrubber?

6 MR. JONES: Comprised -- Uses a solution to
7 reduce, like for SO₂, they are used as a caustic
8 liquid to reduce the sulfur.

9 MR. DRAKE: And does the gas come from that
10 liquid caustic material?

11 MR. JONES: No. Then you have pack-bed
12 scrubber systems that are designed to control
13 particulate matter and some gases. But these are
14 primarily, the scrubbers here are for SO₂ particulate
15 and VOM.

16 MR. DRAKE: Well, I got another question
17 about farms. Are you talking about American farms
18 that would accept this kind of material? Or are you
19 talking overseas that would accept material that is
20 from waste product of human waste product?

21 MR. ROMAINE: Sewage sludge is routinely
22 applied to farms throughout the country.

23 Can't hear.

24 MR. ROMAINE: Sewage sludge is applied to

1 farms throughout the country.

2 MR. DRAKE: Since when?

3 MR. ROMAIN: Since there was a country.

4 Land disposal is a commonly accepted technique for
5 dealing with sewage sludge. It's no different, in
6 some respects, than applying manure from farm animals
7 back onto farm fields. It has nutrient value that
8 can be incorporated into the soil.

9 MR. DRAKE: And we have seen what happens
10 with the bio -- bovine, where they eat, they give
11 ground-up cattle to have them eat the cattle.

12 MR. ROMAIN: This is not a concern that I
13 am aware of for sludge. The concern for sludge is
14 actually one that is addressed in the regulations
15 that address use of sludge in this manner. And the
16 concern is not from human waste as it is from
17 industrial waste. And industrial processes use
18 materials, chemicals, metals, that can accumulate in
19 the sewage sludge; and it's very important that
20 sewage sludge be sampled to assure that the levels of
21 those materials in the sludge will not over long-term
22 application damage the quality of the soil.

23 The way that those are most commonly
24 dealt with is actually going back to the

1 manufacturing processes to phase those materials out
2 of use or have other means of disposing of them
3 besides flushing them down the sewer.

4 MR. DRAKE: How often does the EPA come out
5 and check, or do they allow the plant themselves to
6 self-check?

7 MR. ROMAIN: Routine verification is done
8 through self-checks. Plants that have sludge are
9 required to routinely analyze the sludge and
10 determine its composition. If necessary, the
11 Illinois EPA or other federal agency or federal USEPA
12 can take samples and do independent evaluation. But
13 the approach that is commonly applied in
14 environmental regulation is that the basic day-to-day
15 analyst, sampling, monitoring of operations is
16 conducted by the source. The role of government is
17 to oversee and make sure that the source is doing it
18 properly. That puts the burden for compliance where
19 it belongs for the day-to-day activities on the
20 source and the government agency then has a
21 supervisory role.

22 MR. DRAKE: So you believe what they say
23 when they write in whatever they want to?

24 MR. ROMAIN: No. That's why there is the

1 provision for spot checks that assures that their
2 system, what they are doing, in fact, provides
3 accurate data.

4 One of the most egregious crimes a
5 source can commit is false reporting.

6 MR. DRAKE: That's correct.

7 MR. ROMAIN: That brings down the full
8 force of regulatory agencies. You are better off
9 telling us you screwed up and made a mistake than
10 lying to us. That's why when you hear about people
11 being sent to jail for criminal violations of
12 environmental laws, that's because they lied.

13 MR. DRAKE: This is the eighth wonder of the
14 world as they put it on their gates, their open gate,
15 their main gate that, you know, the entrance. And
16 it's pretty big.

17 MR. ROMAIN: Yes, it is.

18 MR. DRAKE: It helps to take care of the
19 metropolitan -- metro Chicago. Well, does that, you
20 said something about the North Shore. Isn't that the
21 same company?

22 MR. ROMAIN: No, it is not. I'm not sure
23 where the dividing line is between the area that the
24 North Shore serves and the territory that the

1 Metropolitan Water Reclamation District serves.

2 MR. DRAKE: How many silos would they have,
3 would be built?

4 MR. JONES: There is a silo system for each
5 drying line. There is four drying lines. There
6 would be four silos.

7 MR. DRAKE: And I have got to get to these
8 other questions. Do you have any new, new things to
9 present since your last meeting at Morton College?
10 That this is nothing new, it's just you got, you
11 changed, changed the procedure, eliminating or
12 separating the two companies? So then there is
13 really nothing new?

14 MR. JONES: Well, I mean there are changes
15 to the project. Both changes are minor. They went
16 from four thermal oil heaters, each at 20 million
17 Btus down to three at 27 million Btu. And I would
18 like to think that as far as what we put in here, we
19 put a lot more stringent recordkeeping on their part
20 as far as analysis of material that they are treating
21 and the fuel that they are using.

22 MR. DRAKE: This recycled oil doesn't
23 have -- Well, I'm a cook. I like to cook. And if
24 you recycle, like any kind of oil, carcinogens become

1 a factor. So if you are recycling oil in another
2 process, don't more carcinogens become part of the
3 particulate that's coming out of the system?

4 MR. JONES: As far as the combustion process
5 goes, the reclaimed oil or used oil is -- actually
6 has a very similar Btu content as far as firing
7 capabilities as the normal fuel oil or even diesel
8 fuel.

9 The instances here, you might have in
10 some cases slightly increased sulfur content and ash
11 content might be slightly higher than is typical fuel
12 oil. So what we did was in this permit we actually
13 addressed particulate emissions from the fuel
14 combustion process as the maximum emission rate due
15 to the ash content of the fuel, which is a very
16 conservative approach to estimating what the
17 emissions will be.

18 The control efficiency of the scrubber
19 system designed to reduce emissions to
20 92 percent, I believe, is the level of control that
21 they -- that the scrubber will achieve. This
22 significantly reduces the amount of particulate
23 matter coming from the process or fuel combustion
24 process via burning of waste oil.

1 MR. DRAKE: The wastewater --

2 MR. JONES: Waste oil. Are you talking
3 about wastewater?

4 MR. DRAKE: Well, let's go through the
5 process a little bit. The water, where does that
6 come from? Does that come from the canal?

7 MR. JONES: That comes from -- I'm sorry.
8 That comes from the MWRD. It's not water, it's --

9 MR. DRAKE: Sludge?

10 MR. JONES: It's wet, treated sludge.

11 MR. DRAKE: But to get that water, is that
12 from fresh water; or is that from the canal? Because
13 when sometimes when we talk about Metropolitan
14 Sanitary District and Ship Canal, I don't know if
15 that's attached in regards to some sort of company
16 business, incorporation, whatever; but is that where
17 they get their water for use, or is it fresh water?

18 MR. JONES: As far as water, I assume it's
19 fresh water. It's not wastewater or anything like
20 that. Because in order for it to be used in any
21 process, it would have to be clean. As far as the
22 waste, the wet sludge, it is -- the moisture content
23 is comprised of, you know, a variety of things. Part
24 of it is probably water, but I wouldn't know exactly

1 whether it's coming from the canal district or that.

2 MR. DRAKE: Do you know how much fresh water
3 they would be using per year?

4 MR. JONES: No.

5 MR. DRAKE: Because I noticed today that
6 there was a city or village that had a boil, boil-
7 their-water warning on TV. And not everybody watches
8 TV, not everybody listens to the radio. Some of
9 those people are going to get sick. Not having
10 enough clean water is part of living on this earth.
11 So I guess that's indirectly attached to using clean
12 water for such a system.

13 Let's see, can I open the microphone to
14 somebody else; and I will -- I may come back.

15 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Sure. That's
16 fine. That's fine.

17 Thank you, Mr. Drake. Do we have any
18 additional comments or questions from anyone? No?

19 Hold on, sir.

20 MR. HAASE: My name is Keith Haase. I'm
21 from the Cicero-Berwyn -- Hello. Can you hear me
22 now?

23 Keith Haase, H-a-a-s-e, Cicero-Berwyn
24 Life. I just wanted verification on the first

1 gentleman, Mr. Williams' question. You did not
2 answer whether there would be an increased odor
3 emission from the site. You said that they, that the
4 original one wasn't any of your concern, but you
5 didn't know if the new one was going to add to it.

6 MR. ROMAINE: The new one should not add
7 odor. This facility should not add odor given the
8 levels of controls that are being used. On the other
9 hand, there are emissions associated with the
10 project. It does have particulate matter emissions.
11 So you can't say it will have absolutely no effect.
12 But it is a very different type of operation than the
13 wastewater treatment operations that the MWRD
14 conducts. This is a mechanical processing operation
15 located inside a building, with control equipment
16 discharging through an elevated stack.

17 MR. HAASE: Okay. Thank you.

18 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Okay. We will
19 take a five-minute break then, and then come back for
20 any additional comments or questions.

21 (Recess had.)

22 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Okay. We will
23 go back on. Once again, if there is anyone who has
24 any questions or comments, if you would like, please

1 approach the podium.

2 MR. WILLIAMS: Hi. Patrick Williams. I
3 just wanted to reiterate a question I just asked you.
4 How often does the EPA check on a day-to-day
5 emissions what the plant will do?

6 MR. ROMAIN: Our goal for major source is
7 to get out to them once a year. I don't think we are
8 quite meeting that objective. My understanding is
9 that we make it about 80 percent of the major sources
10 once a year.

11 MR. WILLIAMS: Is the testing done by the
12 EPA of these facilities a public record? Like can I
13 find out how many times you would, you have checked
14 on, for example, on Stickney Works?

15 MR. ROMAIN: Yes, it is. You can submit a
16 Freedom of Information Act request for a copy of the
17 inspection reports, the inspections that we
18 conducted.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. I just --

20 MR. ROMAIN: Now, in terms of the air
21 group, we do not do testing. When you are dealing
22 with a facility of this type, you evaluate emissions
23 through engineering calculations. There isn't a
24 simple way to go out and measure the amount of

1 emissions that are being produced.

2 MR. WILLIAMS: I think it would, those of us
3 that live in the community would feel a lot better
4 about it if all of that was public, if it was told to
5 us, and if we didn't have to go through Freedom of
6 Information Act to find out, you know, how often the
7 EPA is checking on this. If this is something that
8 was reported, I think we would feel a lot more
9 comfortable about these kind of things going up in
10 our community.

11 MR. ROMAIN: I can certainly understand
12 that, and I agree with you. That's something we are
13 trying to enhance the level of information that we
14 directly provide. Now that we have an Internet, we
15 have increased the amount of some types of
16 information; but the air division has not got
17 information on inspections on to the system yet.

18 MR. WILLIAMS: I'm curious, you said that
19 the odors should not increase. What is the procedure
20 if they do, or is there one? Does the EPA have a --
21 Does the EPA do something about the fact that if they
22 do increase?

23 MR. ROMAIN: The general procedure for
24 dealing with odors is a procedure that involves

1 basically nuisance. And when we receive complaints
2 of odors, we go to the source and see what is the
3 cause of the odor, see what can be done to correct
4 the odor.

5 Obviously, the ones that are simplest
6 to deal with is if something went wrong with the
7 source and it's just a matter of saying, Don't do
8 that in the future. When it's something like a
9 wastewater treatment plant of this size, it's a
10 continuing challenge to make sure that when
11 opportunities come available that the MWRD take
12 advantage of them to do things that would reduce the
13 level of odors that it's putting into the air.

14 MR. WILLIAMS: When was the last time the
15 EPA inspected at Stickney?

16 MR. ROMAINE: I don't have that information
17 with me. I would have to provide that to you from
18 Springfield.

19 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Again, I'm going to
20 reiterate this, those of us that live in the
21 community would feel a lot more comfortable about it
22 if it wasn't something that was -- Like I found out
23 about this hearing because I just happened to look in
24 the paper the day that it was put in there. And I

1 have spoken to my alderman in Berwyn. They didn't
2 know about it. I mean, I don't know if -- If you
3 said you contacted the government in Stickney, but
4 the government in Berwyn wasn't contacted about it,
5 at least my alderman wasn't; and she lives in the
6 ward where -- in my ward close, so she can smell the
7 stuff just as much as I can.

8 We weren't notified about it. And
9 while the Reclamation District is just in Stickney,
10 this, the odor and the emission doesn't really care
11 about the border. And since I live relatively close
12 to there, it affects me directly. So it feels just
13 kind of -- I mean I'm not accusing anybody of
14 anything. It just feels kind of sneaky when there
15 are just one or two notices, and then you change the
16 venue all the sudden, not that it was your fault.
17 But I told my alderman about it, she hadn't heard
18 about it. I told all the people in my neighborhood
19 about it, and none of them had heard about it.

20 So I think -- I mean and clearly not
21 many people heard about it because nobody is here or
22 not that many people are here. No offense to
23 anybody. Some more transparency would be really
24 helpful for us as a community to really understand

1 when these changes are happening. I guess I will
2 leave the table open for anyone else.

3 MR. ROMAIN: Thank you for the comments.

4 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you,
5 Mr. Williams. Anyone else?

6 MR. DRAKE: Daniel Drake. Why are these
7 numbers different in regard to under Applicable
8 Emissions Standards, the no more than .5 pounds per
9 million Btu and then the other one is --

10 MR. JONES: What section are you looking at?

11 MR. DRAKE: No. 4. Applicable Emission
12 Standards, total halogen content of used,
13 reclaimed oil.

14 MR. JONES: Okay.

15 MR. DRAKE: 1,000 ppm. Is that pounds per
16 square meter?

17 MR. JONES: No, ppm is parts per million.

18 MR. DRAKE: Parts per million. And what's
19 the -- Why is the difference in there?

20 MR. JONES: These are actually land
21 requirements for the oil.

22 MR. DRAKE: What requirements?

23 MR. JONES: Land, Bureau of Land. Bureau of
24 Land requirements.

1 MR. ROMAIN: Well, actually they are still
2 state requirements.

3 MR. JONES: Well, yes.

4 MR. ROMAIN: These are standards that have
5 been developed for used oil that define acceptable
6 composition. If the composition was above these
7 levels, it cannot be treated as if it were simply
8 equivalent to fresh, virgin fuel oil, it then has to
9 be treated as a waste material. If the level of
10 contaminant in the used oil has been at these levels
11 for purposes of combustion, it's essentially treated
12 as if it is a virgin fuel oil.

13 But the level varies depending on the
14 nature of what's being addressed. So when you are
15 talking about ash as a total measurement for
16 noncombustible material, that includes things such as
17 build-up of -- It would be typical of calcium
18 carbonate, minimal type material that might be
19 present in the oil. Halogen refers to chlorine and
20 flourine, which might be present as a result of being
21 included in oil additives that might be added to an
22 oil. And then finally, lead would be a material that
23 would be found in oil due to the breakdown of metal
24 in an engine.

1 So, obviously, there shouldn't be very
2 much lead in oil. Accordingly, the limit for lead is
3 100 parts per million. There may be higher levels of
4 chlorine, which would be when it's burned forms
5 hydrogen chloride. The level for that is 1,000 parts
6 per million. The value for ash, if you converted it
7 into a parts per million, is -- I have to do that --
8 7,000 parts per million. So it's simply a reflection
9 of what is an appropriate level of different types of
10 material in the actual oil.

11 MR. DRAKE: How old are those standards?

12 MR. ROMAIN: Those standards have been
13 around for a while. I don't know the exact date,
14 age, whether it's 20 years, 15 years.

15 MR. DRAKE: Before Truman?

16 MR. ROMAIN: No.

17 MR. DRAKE: In the case of these emissions
18 that -- You know, I notice that the telephone
19 company was putting up Spanish signs before any
20 Spanish people came to Stickney. But now we have
21 quite a few. And their birth rate is quite
22 considerable in comparison to other nationalities.
23 What is the concern that you might have, whereas I
24 have a feeling that there might not be too much

1 concern, about birth defects such as with regard to
2 lead emissions and all this other stuff?

3 MR. ROMAIN: That's why there is, I should
4 say, as a broad matter, the reason that there are
5 these type of limitations on contaminants of waste
6 oil is to address potential environmental effects.
7 So I don't want to specifically focus on one
8 particular health effect than the other. But these
9 standards are designed to make sure that lead isn't
10 at a level where lead has bad effects and that
11 chlorinated compounds are at a level that chlorinated
12 compounds have effects, and ash is to make sure that
13 particulate matter emissions that are generated for
14 burning of waste oils are not at the same range as
15 particulate matter emissions from burning, you know,
16 traditional fuel oil so --

17 MR. DRAKE: There was a woman here from the
18 Metropolitan Sanitary District. I don't know where
19 she went off to, but she -- She was opposed to this.
20 I don't know why. I agree with her, but I don't know
21 why. I would like to have had her come up and speak,
22 but I don't see her anymore. She was here earlier
23 with a child.

24 MR. ROMAIN: Yes. We talked briefly,

1 Ms. Young, in the hall.

2 MR. DRAKE: Okay. How did Stickney approve
3 this? Was it by referendum; or was it by Village
4 officials' approval, just sign off?

5 MR. ROMAIN: The process for local siting
6 approval is vested in the local elected officials.
7 There is a formal process where they have to have a
8 proposal presented before them. They have to review
9 it against certain criteria. They then have another
10 hearing, I guess, or meeting and vote. So it's like
11 other village business that is determined by an
12 official vote of the --

13 MR. DRAKE: The whole Village, each voter?

14 MR. ROMAIN: The state process does not
15 require referendum. It is something that the Village
16 government, the elected board, decides.

17 MR. DRAKE: Because I don't remember the
18 referendum.

19 MR. ROMAIN: No. There is no provision for
20 a referendum.

21 MR. DRAKE: So they just gave you carte
22 blanche, I mean the MBM? MBM.

23 MR. ROMAIN: I don't think that's correct
24 either. I think the Village of Stickney carefully

1 looked at the particular project and said, We are
2 giving siting approval for this particular project
3 proposed by Stickney. I mean MBM, I don't think they
4 authorized MBM to undertake other types of processing
5 of materials at this site. I don't think they
6 authorized them to become a landfill or some other
7 type of thing. It's a very specific for a particular
8 proposal.

9 MR. DRAKE: Right. Right. Can I ask, did
10 they possibly take them out to lunch, give them some
11 cash, anything like that?

12 MR. ROMAINE: I have no knowledge of that.
13 That's about all I can say. I would comment that the
14 Village of Stickney has the concern of its residents,
15 that's part of the reason they are there, and
16 carefully had to examine MBM's proposal to see what
17 its consequences were for the Village, and if it were
18 an appropriate use of land that should be
19 appropriately conducted in the Village.

20 I would assume that because MBM is a
21 private company it would be paying real estate taxes
22 to the Village of Stickney. So from that
23 perspective, the Village of Stickney is looking at a
24 potential commercial venture that would add to its

1 tax base.

2 MR. DRAKE: But beyond MWRD's property, we
3 wouldn't get any more than we already have. Is that
4 true? Tax. There would be no tax increase because
5 it's on somebody else's property.

6 MR. ROMAINE: I don't think that's correct.
7 If you run a business, even if you are running it on
8 a rented property, you are still a business and there
9 are taxes that you are going to be paying. Now, they
10 may not be the same taxes; but you are going to be
11 paying income taxes or other types of taxes.

12 MR. DRAKE: It's just that MWRD is not going
13 to pay that many taxes and MBM is going to -- It's a
14 transference, not a tax increase.

15 MR. ROMAINE: I'd really have to ask MBM
16 what the tax implications are of the activity.

17 MR. DRAKE: I guess that's all the questions
18 I have, because I'm not an expert on emissions. I'm
19 just a regular citizen. Thank you.

20 HEARING OFFICER MATOESIAN: Thank you,
21 Mr. Drake.

22 Do we have any further comments or
23 questions? No?

24 In that case, I will adjourn this

1 hearing. Please remember, once again, you can submit
2 written comments through August 19, 2005. And they
3 must only be postmarked by then. We don't have to
4 receive them by that date. So thank you all for
5 coming and good night.

6 * * *

7 (Which were all the proceedings had
8 in the above-entitled cause.)
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)

) ss.

2 COUNTY OF DU PAGE)

3
4 I, JANICE H. HEINEMANN, CSR, RDR, CRR,
5 do hereby certify that I am a court reporter doing
6 business in the State of Illinois, that I reported in
7 shorthand the testimony given at the hearing of said
8 cause, and that the foregoing is a true and correct
9 transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as
10 aforesaid.

11
12
13
14
15 _____
16 Janice H. Heinemann CSR, RDR, CRR
17 License No 084-001391
18
19
20
21
22
23
24